NOV. 21. 2005 3:12PM



RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 2 1 2005

### **FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

DATE: November 21, 2005

Examiner NGUTEN, Quang FAX NO.: 571/273-8300

N.

TO:

USPTO GPAU 2141

FROM: Jeffrey G. Toler

Reg. No.: 38,342

**RE U.S. App. No.:** 10/700,337, filed November 3, 2003

Applicant(s): Kenneth Roger Jones, et al.

Atty Dkt No.: 1033-MS1006

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD TO IDENTIFY CUSTOMER PREMISE

**EQUIPMENT DEVICES** 

NO. OF PAGES (including Cover Sheet): 9

### **MESSAGE:**

Attached please find:

Notice of Appeal (1 pg);

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (1 pg); and

Remarks in Support of the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (5 pgs).

Received 2 pages

5000 Plaza On The Lake Suite 265 Austin, Texas 78746

Tel: (512) 327-5515
Fov: (512) 327-5452

### **CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE**

The pages accompanying this facsimile transmission contain information from the law office of Toler, Larson & Abel. L.L.P. and are confidential and privileged. The information is intended to be used by the individual(s) or entity(tes) named on this cover sheet only. If you are not the intended recipient be aware that reading disclosing copying distribution or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited. Please notify us immediately if you have received this transmission in error at the mamber listed above and return the document to us via regular mail.



RECEIVED **CENTRAL FAX CENTER** NOV 2 1 2005

# **FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

DATE:

November 21, 2005

TO:

Examiner NGUTEN, Quang

FAX NO.:

571/273-8300

**USPTO GPAU 2141** 

FROM:

Jeffrey G. Toler

Reg. No.: 38,342

**RE U.S. App. No.:** 10/700,337, filed November 3, 2003

Applicant(s): Kenneth Roger Jones, et al.

Atty Dkt No.: 1033-MS1006

Title:

SYSTEM AND METHOD TO IDENTIFY CUSTOMER PREMISE

**EQUIPMENT DEVICES** 

NO. OF PAGES (including Cover Sheet): 9

#### **MESSAGE:**

Attached please find:

☐ Transmittal Form (1 pg);

Notice of Appeal (1 pg);

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (1 pg); and

Remarks in Support of the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (5 pgs).

5000 Plaza On The Lake Suite 265 AUSTIN, TEXAS 78746

Tel: (512) 327-5515 Fax: (512) 327-5452

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Patient and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number 10/700,337 TRANSMITTAL Filing Date 11/03/2003 **FORM** First Named Inventor Kenneth Roger JONES et al. Art Unit Examiner Name NGUYEN, Quang N. (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number Total Number of Pages in This Submission 1033-MS1006 **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC 4 Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Fee Attached Licensing-related Pepers of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC Petition **Amendment/Reply** (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Petition to Convert to a After Final Provisional Application Proprietary Information Power of Attorney, Revocation Affidavlts/declaration(s) Status Letter Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify Extension of Time Request Terminal Disclaimer (woled Request for Refund (1) Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Express Abandonment Request Review Information Disclosure Statement CD, Number of CD(s) (2) Remarks in Support of The Pre-Appeal Brief Request Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) CUSTOMER NO.: 34456 Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, LLP Signature Printed name Jeffrey G. Toler Date 11-21-2005 Reg. No. 38.342 **CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING** I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mall in en envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below. Signature 1h Emma L. Meyer Date Typed or printed name

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to

	US	PTC/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for Use Brough 07/31/2006, OMB 0651-0031 Patient and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no perso	Application Number	Allo OMB control number.			
TRANSMITTAL	Filing Date	10/700,337			
FORM	First Named Inventor	11/03/2003			
1 0 1 0 1	Art Unit	Kenneth Roger JONES et al.			
	Examiner Name	2141			
(to be used for all correspondence after initial ffiling)	Attorney Docket Number	NGUYEN, Quang N.			
Total Number of Pages In This Submission 6	Amonto Docket Number	1033-MS1006			
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)					
1 —	Drawing(s)	After Allowance Communication to TC			
Fee Attached	Licensing-related Papers	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences			
	Petition Petition to Convert to a	Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)			
After Final	Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation	Proprietary Information			
Affidavits/declaration(s)	Affidevits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence A				
Extension of Time Request	Terminal Disclaimer	Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below):			
Express Abandonment Request F	Request for Refund	(1) Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review			
Information Disclosure Statement	CD, Number of CD(s)	——— (2) Remarks in Support of The			
[	Landscape Table on CD	Dec A = = =   Dec CD			
Certified Copy of Priority Remark Document(s)	ks				
Reply to Missing Parts/ CUST	Reply to Missing Parts/ CUSTOMER NO.: 34456				
Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts	٠				
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53					
SIGNATURE O	F APPLICANT, ATTOR	NEY, OR AGENT			
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L	LP				
Signature // /					
Printed name Jeffrey G. Toler					
Date //- 1/- 2005	Re	eg. No. 38,342			
<del></del>	ATE OF TRANSMISSIC				
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsim sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addr the date shown below:	lle transmitted to the USPTO resed to: Commissioner for F	or deposited with the United States Postal Service with Petents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexendria, VA 22313-1460 on			
Signature Gmma Z- 11	Wen				
Typed or printed name Emma L. Meyer		Date 11N, 2, 105			

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.6. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentially is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case, Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief information Officer, U.S. Patert and Tradernark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS, SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Doc Code: AP PRE REQ

Doc Code: AP.PRE,REQ			PTO/88/33	(07_05)
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to response	U.S. Patent e	Approved for and Trademark Office of information unless	use innough XX/XX/200x, OMB 06:	51-00xx
		Docket Number (Optional)		
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REV	IEW	1033-MS1006		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mall	Application N	pplication Number Filed		
In an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]	10/700,377		11/03/2003	
on -110 reproblem 1, 2005	First Named Inventor			
Signature anna L. Mufr	Kenneth Roger Jones			
0	Art Unit E		Examiner	
name Emma L. Meyer	2141		Nguyen	
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above- with this request.	identified app	plication. No a	amendments are being	filed
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.				
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attac Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided	ched sheet(s)	).		
i am the				
applicant/Inventor.		Also 1	2-	
assignee of record of the entire interest.	Signature			
Sea 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)	Jeffrey G. Toler Typed or printed name			
attorney or agent of record.		i ypsu t	A bratted traine	
Registration number			2) 327-5515	′
		Telepi	hone number	ı
x attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.	_ 11-21-2005			
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 38,342	•		Date	$\neg \uparrow$
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire in Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.".	nterest or their n	épresentative(s) a	re required.	
X Total of 1 forms are submitted.				一

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO is process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will very depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the smount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, chould be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, cell 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

Appellants:

Kenneth Roger JONES et al.

**CENTRAL FAX CENTER** 

Title:

SYSTEM AND METHOD TO IDENTIFY CUSTOMER PREMISE

NOV 2 1 2005

**EQUIPMENT DEVICES** 

App. No.:

10/700,337

Filed:

11/03/2003

Examiner:

NGUYEN, Quang N.

Group Art Unit:

2141

Customer No.: 34456

Confirmation No.:

5176

Atty. Dkt. No.: 1033-MS1006

Mail Stop AF

Commissioner for Patents

PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

# REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF THE PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed October 4, 2005 (hereinafter, "the Final Office Action") and pursuant to the Notice of Appeal and Pre-Appeal Brief Request submitted herewith, the Applicants request review of the following issues:

# The Combination of Owens and Iwakata Fails to Disclose At Least One Element of Claims 1-9 and 18-21.

Independent claim 1 recites a broadband access server that receives a data packet during a discovery phase that includes a device identifier comprising a plurality of data fields corresponding to a digital subscriber line (DSL) customer premises equipment (CPE) device. Similarly, Independent claim 18 recites a broadband access server adapted to receive a data packet during a discovery phase that includes an identifier comprising a device identifier and a device hardware identifier corresponding to the DSL CPE device.

The Final Office Action acknowledges that U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0053443 ("Owens") does not teach that the device identifier includes a plurality of fields. See Final Office Action, p. 3. The Final Office Action asserts that U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0095299 ("Iwakata") teaches a customer information control system in which the electronic equipment automatically reads out the product information, including a product model number, a manufacturer's serial number, and the like. See Final Office Action, p. 3. However, Applicants note that Iwakata assumes that a network connection is established when the data is sent. See Iwakata, Abstract.

The asserted motivation to combine Owens and Iwakata lacks support in the references. In particular, Iwakata is directed to a product registration system where device information and customer information are sent to a host system for registration, and the product device information is used, for example, to check for existing data records in the system in order to duplicate data entries. See Iwakata, paragraph 0080. While Owens uses only a single data point (a MAC address) for provisioning of services (See Owens, paragraph 0083 and 0084), Iwakata sends multiple data fields after such services have been established (See Iwakata, paragraphs 0073-0075). Neither Owens nor Iwakata provide a suggestion or motivation to use a plurality of fields during a discovery phase. Thus, there is no motivation provided in the references to make the asserted combination. Therefore, the asserted combination of Owens and Iwakata is improper and should be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicants note that there is no reasonable expectation of success, in part, because the system of Iwakata is technically inconsistent with the system of Owens. See Reply to Non-Final Office Action, filed September 20, 2005, ("NFOA Reply") p. 8. In particular, Owens is directed to provisioning broadband services (see Owens, Abstract and paragraph 0002, for example). Iwakata is unrelated to provisioning of broadband services. In contrast to claim 1 and in contrast to Owens, Iwakata checks for the existence of a connection prior to requesting personal information input and prior to reading product identification information (see, for example, Iwakata, step 301 in FIG. 3 as compared to step 401 in FIG. 5). Thus, Iwakata first establishes a connection and, after the connection is established, then downloads or uploads personal information (steps 303 and sequence) and/or product information (step 401 in FIG. 5). Thus, the download or upload disclosed by Iwakata does not occur during a discovery phase.

Thus, the two references are technically inconsistent, and therefore the asserted combination is improper.

Even if combined, the asserted combination of Iwakata and Owens fails to disclose or suggest a broadband access server that receives a data packet during a discovery phase that includes a device identifier comprising a plurality of data fields corresponding to the DSL CPE device, as recited in independent claim 1. The asserted combination of Iwakata and Owens also fails to disclose or suggest a broadband access server that is adapted to receive a data packet during a discovery phase that includes an identifier comprising a device identifier and a device hardware identifier corresponding to the DSL CPE device, as recited in claim 18.

Claims 2-9 depend from independent claim 1, and claims 19-21 depend from independent claim 18. The asserted combination of Iwakata and Owens fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of claims 1 and 18; therefore, the combination of Iwakata and Owens fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of the dependent claims 2-9 and 19-21, at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 18.

# The Combination of Owens and Iwakata Fails to Disclose At Least One Element of Claims 10-17.

Neither Owens nor Iwakata disclose or suggest a customer service terminal for receiving and displaying the device identifier, as recited in claim 10.

Owens fails to disclose or suggest a customer service terminal. The Final Office Action asserts that Iwakata discloses a customer information input/display unit 13 that receives and displays the customer management information. See Final Office Action, pp. 5-6. However, Applicants note that the display unit 13 is part of the data processing unit 100 of the client machine 10. Therefore, the display unit 13 of Iwakata is a customer user terminal, as opposed to a customer service terminal as recited in claim 10. Moreover, the display unit 13 of Iwakata displays "check results of the stored information and the received information." See Iwakata, paragraph 0071. Iwakata states that the information input/display unit 13 receives the personal information (PI) necessary for a customer information control by a host machine 20 and displays the results of data check from the host machine 20 "including double registration error as for the

same PC." See Iwakata, paragraph 0074. Iwakata also discloses sending and displaying a user registration number. See Iwakata, Figure 10, reference numerals 905 and 906, and paragraph 0108. Thus, the check results feature of Iwakata is a registration number or registration error, and not the device identifier of claim 10. Therefore, the asserted combination of Owens and Iwakata fails to disclose or suggest a customer service terminal for receiving the device identifier and displaying the device identifier to a user of the customer service terminal, as recited in claim 10.

Additionally, as previously discussed, Owens and Iwakata are technically inconsistent. Owens is directed to provisioning broadband services (See Owens, Abstract and paragraph 0002, for example), while Iwakata downloads personal information only after the connection is established. See Iwakata, 301 in Figure 3 as compared to 401 in Figure 4, for example). Thus, the download of Iwakata occurs only after the provisioning of broadband services of Owens. There is no motivation or suggestion in either reference to make the asserted combination, and the two references are technically inconsistent. Therefore, the asserted combination of Owens and Iwakata is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 11-17 depend from independent claim 10. The asserted combination of Owens and Iwakata fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of independent claim 10. Therefore, the combination of Owens and Iwakata fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of each of the dependent claims 11-17, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable independent claim 10.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the asserted combination of Owens and Iwakta is improper and should be withdrawn, since the provisioning of Owens is inconsistent with the download of Iwakata. Moreover, the Final Office Action fails to establish that the proposed combination of Owens and Iwakata discloses or suggests each and every element of independent claims 1, 10 and 18. The Final Office Action therefore fails to establish that the proposed combination of Owens and Iwakata discloses or suggests each and every element of claims 2-9, 11-17, and 19-21, at least by virtue of their dependency from one of claims 1, 10 or 18.

Accordingly, the rejections of the pending claims are improper, and the Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of these rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

11-4-2028

Date

Jeffrey G. Toler, 38,342

TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P. 5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265

Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 327-5515 (phone)

(512) 327-5452 (fax)